The Bangalore City Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The motion to consider the Bangalore City Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee has been adopted by the House on the 8th. The clauses of the Bill will now be submitted to the House. Clauses 2 to 29, both inclusive.

The question is :—

"That Clauses 2 to 29, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 29, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is :—

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is :—

"That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA (Minister for Finance and Industries).—Sir, I move :—

"That the Bangalore City Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :—

"That the Bangalore City Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

The City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951.

Motion to consider.

*The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA (Minister for Finance and Industries).—Sir, I move :—

"That the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

Sir, my task in this respect has been considerably eased because of the interesting discussion we have had on the City of Bangalore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951. So, without taking much of the time of the House, I place my motion before the House for its acceptance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :—

"That the City of Mysore Improvemen (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

Sri K. R. SREEKANTESWAR (Bangalore City—General).—On a point of information, Sir, may I know whether there was a resolution passed by the Mysore Municipal Council requesting the Government to abolish the Mysore Improvement Trust Board ?

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—The Hon'ble Member may choose to make such remarks as he pleases. I think it will be better if I answer all the points at the end.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Hon'ble Member making any further observation ?

Sri K. R. SREEKANTESWAR.—I wanted that information. That is all.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA (Shimoga District—General).—I would like to know whether they consulted the City Municipality of Mysore, and if they have done so, what exactly their views are on the various provisions contained in this Bill.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Sir, I take it that I am replying to the debate.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Not to the debate. It is merely some information needed by me. The debate has not yet started.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—It is up to the Hon'ble Members generally to have their say and there will be time enough for me to reply thereafter. I think it is a better procedure. But I have no objection to answer that point.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—You answered such points on previous occasions. If you are not inclined to answer this time, I do not find fault with you.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—The Mayor and the other representatives of the Corporation of Bangalore

(THE HON'BLE SRI H. C. DASAPPA). came and attended the meeting of the Select Committee and practically they agreed with everything that the Select Committee decided. It was later being stated that there was no resolution of the Corporation and so on. But in answer to the question raised by Sri K. R. Sreekanteswar and Sri L. Siddappa, I may say that there was a resolution of the Mysore City Municipal Council to the effect that they would like to have a different Bill altogether and that they were not wholly in favour of this Bill. And when they were also given an opportunity to come before the Select Committee in the same manner as the Bangalore Corporation was given, the Mysore Municipal Council sent in a memorandum to the effect that the whole Bill itself must be withdrawn by the Government, while the Bangalore City Corporation gave us helpful constructive suggestions. When the Mysore Municipal Council was informed that it was not possible to withdraw the Bill but that they might come and give their opinion to the Select Committee, they chose to say that in the circumstances, it would not be very useful for them to come before the Select Committee and express their views.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರು (ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿನ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಏನೇನು ಅಂಶಗಳು ಅಡಕವಾಗಿವೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳೂ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿವೆ, ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಅಡಕವಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶಗಳು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿವೆ.

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಸರಹದ್ದಿನೊಳಗೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು locality ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಾಗ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಹಾಗೆ ಕೈಗೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ, ಅಂಥಾ locality ಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಯಾರಯಾರ ಸ್ವತ್ತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲಿದ್ದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಬೆಲೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೋ ಅಂಥವರುಗಳಿಂದ, ಕೆಲವು ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು Betterment Fee ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ, ಕೆಲವು ನಿರ್ಧರವಾಗಿರುವ ಕ್ರಮಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದು.

ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಇಷ್ಟ ಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅನೇಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಗಲೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಈಗ ಪುನಃ ಅದೇ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಲು ಇಚ್ಛೆಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ betterment ಫೀಜನ್ನು ವಿಧಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೆ ಏನು ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರೊವಿಜ಼ಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಾರಣ, ಆ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲದಂಥಾ ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶಗಳು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿವೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ Section 10 of the original Act; ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಎಂದರೆ ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂಬ ಅಂಶ. ಇದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂತಲೂ, ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಕಮ್ಮಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂತಲೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೇಗೆಂದರೆ ಮೊದಲು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡಿಂಗ್ ಇಂಜನಿಯರು ಇರುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇವರನ್ನು ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿದರೂ ಹಾಕ

ಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಗೌರ್ನ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆರ್ಕಿಟಿಕ್ಟ್ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರನ್ನೇ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ, ಅವರು ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ಅವರ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ಸಿಟಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕಮಿಷನರಿಗೇ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಕೂಡ ಇದೆ. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ಇಂಥಾ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಜ್ಞಾಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಅವರು ಇಂಥಾ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಖಾಸಗೀ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಿಗೇ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಾದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಇಂದು ಹೂಡಿರುವ ವಾದ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ತಿರುಳಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಹಿಂದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ವಾದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಇಂದು ಖಾಸಗೀ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಕಮ್ಮಿಮಾಡಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ತರ್ಫಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಾದಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಹುರುಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಅಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟ ಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಆದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಅಡಕವಾಗಿವೆ.

Section 20-A. (1): "In any area or part thereof to which this Act applies, the Government may, by notification in the *Mysore Gazette* declare that from such date and for such period as may be specified therein and subject to such restrictions and modifications, if any, as may be specified in the notification :—

"(i) the powers and functions of the municipal council or a committee thereof under the Mysore City Municipalities Act, 1933, shall be exercised and discharged by the Board; and

(ii) the powers and functions of the Commissioner of the Municipal Council under the said Act, shall be exercised and discharged by the Chairman:

Provided that the Municipal Council shall be consulted before making such declaration.

Sub-section (2) says :

"(2) On the making of a declaration under sub-section (1), notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, the municipal council or any committee thereof or the Commissioner of the Municipal Council, shall not be competent to exercise or discharge the powers or functions conferred or imposed on the Board or the Chairman, as the case may be, by such declaration."

That is consequent on sub-section (1).

"(3) The Board or the Chairman may delegate any of the functions exercisable by it or him under sub-section (1) to any officer or servant of the Board.

"(4) The exercise or discharge of any of the powers or functions delegated under sub-section (3), shall be subject to such limitations, conditions and control, as may be laid down by the Board or the Chairman, as the case may be."

ಈ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಜನ್‌ನನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದ್ದೇ ಆದರೆ ಅದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮವೇನಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವೀಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನೋಡೋಣ. ಈಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಸಗೀ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಿಂತಲೂ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಪರ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯೇ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ ವರ್ಗದವರ ಕೈವಾಡಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ಸಿಟಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕೇವಲ ಎರಡು ಮಾತ್ರ. ಇನ್ನು ಬಾಕಿಯದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಚುನಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರನ್ನು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಮಕರಣಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು. 1933ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿ ಸಿಟಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿ ಆಕ್ಟಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಆ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಏನು ಕೆಲವು ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳಿದ್ದುವೋ, ಅಂಥಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು, ನಾವೀಗ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದರೆ, ಅವರ ಕೈಯಿಂದ ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಇದರಿಂದ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

"In any area or part thereof to which this Act applies, the Government may, by notification in the *Mysore Gazette* declare that from such date and for such period as may be specified therein and subject to such restrictions and modifications, if any....."

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.— That is the point.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರು.— ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲ ಈಗ ಸಿಟಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳು ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸುತ್ತಿವೆಯೋ, ಅಂಥಾ ಕಡೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರಕೂಡದೆಂದು ಒಂದು ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿ, ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳಿಗೇ ಇನ್ನುಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಮುಗಿಯಿತು. ಆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ತಪ್ಪಿಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Supposing there are some powers vested in the Municipal Council or the Commissioner himself. If the Government choose, they may by a notification say that these powers which are now being exercised by the municipal council or by a committee of the municipal council or by the Municipal Commissioner will not be exercised by the respective bodies hereafter.

ಈ ತರಹೆ ಒಂದು ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇನ್ನುಮೇಲೆ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು. ಎಚ್. ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪನವರು (ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ).—ಇವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹಂಗಾಮಿ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳು.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—The notification remains in force for a period specified in the notification.

Supposing for the sake of argument I say that the municipal council or a committee constituted by the municipal council has powers of issuing licence and by virtue of the notification issued by Government those powers are taken away and given over to the Trust Board; then I think the municipality will be placed low in the estimation of the public and the municipal administration will not go on smoothly. There will be a hitch between the municipal council and the Trust Board. ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಅವುಗಳಿಗಿಲ್ಲದಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳನ್ನೇ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕೆಬಿಡಿ. ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕಮಿಷನರೇ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು exercise ಮಾಡುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—The Hon'ble member has totally misunderstood the scope of that particular provision. It is nowhere stated that over the whole area of the Municipality such powers will be taken away.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Supposing in the Notification you say that throughout the entire jurisdiction of the Municipal Council such and such powers are taken away from it and entrusted to the Board?

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—It is not like that. If the Hon'ble Member reads the section that is already there in the original Act, he would have found that even those certain powers of the Municipal Council and of the Commissioner and also of the President were being delegated to the Chairman for certain specific purposes. So it is only in such cases that such powers have been delegated to the Chairman and that is only temporarily where the question of slum clearance is taken up or the question of new lay-out in the City Municipal Council is taken up on the motion of the Municipal Council itself. The question of even licensing may come up when the layout is formed.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Who should delegate the powers?

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—The Act itself says that it may be done.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Is it the Municipal Council or the Government?

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—It is so obvious. The Act itself provides for it. Please see section 21 of the Bangalore City Improvement Act. I suppose it is the same in Mysore. You find on page 11 of the original Act that the Board may exercise certain powers of the Municipal Councils in regard to streets, drains, sewers, services, etc., and also recovery of costs, etc.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—There is no such provision in the City of Mysore Improvement Regulation of 1903. Section 21 of the Regulation reads like this:

"The President of the Municipal Council shall on being satisfied that any street formed by the Board has been duly levelled, paved, metalled, flagged, channelled, drained and sewered in the manner provided for in the plans of any scheme sanctioned by Government and

that such lamps, lamp posts and other apparatus as are in his opinion necessary for the lighting thereof and should be provided by the Board have been so provided, declare such street to be a public street, and such street shall thereupon vest or re-vest, as the case may be, in the Municipal Councillors, and the Municipal Councillors shall thenceforward maintain, keep in repair, light and cleanse such street."

That is taking away a portion of the area which has been improved from the Trust Board to the Municipal Council for its maintenance. Nowhere such a power is given under the existing Act. ಇದರಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಸೊ ಬೇರೆ ಇದೆ ಅದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ :

"Provided that the Municipal Council shall be consulted before making such declaration....."

ಇದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷ ಹೊರಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು, ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೋ, ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂದು ನೋಡುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಕನ್ಸಲ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಲ್ಲ.

In spite of the opinion expressed by the Municipal Council, Government have taken powers to issue such a Notification. I think it is a highly retrograde step taken and I do not think that this House will approve of such a provision.

Then again there is this sub-clause (3) which states that—

"The Board or the Chairman may delegate any of the functions exercisable by it or him under sub-section (1) to any officer or servant of the Board."

ಇಂಥ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ನಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಛೇರ್ಮನ್ನರು ಅಥವಾ ಬೋರ್ಡು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಅಥವಾ ಛೇರ್ಮನ್ನರ ಕೈಕೆಳಗಿನ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ವಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಹೀಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪಡೆಯುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನ 19ನೆಯ ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಸ್ಷ ಇದೆ. ಅದು ಈರೀತಿ ಇದೆ :

"In section 21 of the said Act,—(1) In sub-section (1) for the words "The President of the Municipal Council" and "his opinion," the words "The Government after consulting the Municipal Council" and "their opinion" shall, respectively, be substituted; and for the word "Councillors," the word "Council" shall be substituted," and "(2) in sub-section (2), for the word "Councillors", the word "Council" shall be substituted."

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ರಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಡ್ರೈನೇಜು, ದೀಪದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ, ಸ್ಯಾನಿಟರಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮುಂತಾದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶವನ್ನು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಮೈಂಟಿನೆನ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ಗೆ ವಹಿಸುವಂತೆ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಷ್ಠ ಇತ್ತು. ಆಗ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆಂದರೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾಗಿ ವಿಧಾಯಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದ ಕಾಲ ದೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಮಾಡದೇಹೋದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅಥವಾ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೈಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರು ಯಾರೋ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದುದರಿಂದ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡದೇ ಹೋದರೂ ಪರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಂದಾಜು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅಂಥಾ ಅಂದಾಜು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೂ ಆ ಭಾಗದ ಮೈಂಟಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದರು.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.— What is the provision that the Hon'ble Member is referring to ?

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—I am referring to clause 19 in the new Bill.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.— The Hon'ble Member is referring to something that was existing before.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರು.—ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರು)

ಆಕ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬೇರೊಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಆಗಲೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು objection ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆ. ಈಗ 19ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿರುವುದೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಿದೆ.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Was there anything in the Mysore City Improvement Act?

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Section 21 of the Mysore City Improvement Act was analogous provision which would be found in the Bangalore City Improvement Trust Board Act.

ಹಿಂದೆ 21ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದಾಗ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿದ್ದೆ, ಅಂಥ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಈಗ ಪುನಃ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಅದನ್ನು ರೆಫರ್ ಮಾಡಿದೆ.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—The Hon'ble member is referring to the Bill itself. He is not referring to the recommendations of the Select Committee or the report of the Select Committee. He has started a general discussion on the original Bill itself. I do not know whether this is the proper time for him to take up the clauses in the Bill and carry on a discussion on them. I think that he should discuss on the recommendations of the Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think he is discussing clause 19 in this Bill.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—I am speaking of the report of the Select Committeee.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಾಗಿರಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Yes, report of the Select Committee is in respect of the provisions contained in the Bill. Is it not?

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—What is it that they have said in section 19? There is nothing that they have said there.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—They have said that even though improvements have not been effected, still on the recommendation of the Trust Board the Municipal Council may take over that area for its maintenance.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Please refer to the report of the Select Committee. Hon'ble Member is discussing the original Bill that was placed before the House last time.

Sri T. MADIAH GOWDA (Bangalore District—General).—Rule 71 clearly states:

"The debate on a motion that the Bill as reported by the Select Committee be taken into consideration shall be confined to consideration of the report of the Select Committee and the matters referred to in that report or any alternative suggestions consistent with the principle of the Bill."

According to this he cannot refer to matters that are not found in the Select Committee report.

Mr. SPEAKER.—With regard to clause 19 no alteration has been proposed by the Select Committee.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—We can make alternative suggestions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes, on that.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It will be very difficult to confine ourselves to the recommendations. While dealing with them, we may have to refer to so many extraneous matters.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not extraneous. The Hon'ble Member is now referring to clause 19 which has not been altered.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—It has got an immediate bearing on other clauses.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—None whatever.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Whenever this point was raised by the Hon'ble Minister I have been making a submission that in a debate on the consideration of Select Committee Report one could raise any point. For instance, I referred yesterday to the discussion that was going on in Parliament on the Select Committee Report submitted by the Committee appointed in connection with the Press Bill. Therein, not merely the points on which the Select Committee made a report but even other points have been considered.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member can oppose that clause if he wants when I submit that clause for consideration by the House.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Debate cannot be restricted in that fashion. Otherwise, the whole force will go.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Bill was already discussed and was referred to the Select Committee and now the House is considering the Bill as reported by the Select Committee. If the Hon'ble Member wants to oppose any clause, he can do so when I submit the Bill to the House, clause by clause.

The Hon'ble Sri K. T. BHASHYAM (Minister for Law and Labour).—I may interfere and state that the object of moving that a certain Bill be referred to a Select Committee is to enable members to object to any principle involved in that Bill. That is the stage at which Hon'ble Members will have to oppose any particular clause or principle. Once we refer the matter to the Select Committee, it means that the House is in accord with the principles of the Bill. And the principles being accepted, the Select Committee is called upon to make such changes as it may consider necessary. When the Bill comes back from the Select Committee, it is only the amendments that the Select Committee has made that are liable for discussion. Of course it is open for any Hon'ble Member, if the Select Committee has not taken into consideration the opinions already advanced on the floor of this House against any provision of the Bill, to move an amendment that such and such a clause may be omitted or to oppose it. We cannot discuss the same thing over and over again. At the time we refer the matter to the Select Committee we discuss in general all the clauses and the principles involved in the Bill and it is open to Hon'ble Members to have those clauses removed if they like by moving suitable amendments or they may refer the matter to the Select Committee. After it comes back, if they are not satisfied with any particular clause they may move an amendment that such and such a clause may be omitted but they cannot raise a discussion on that because it will be a duplication of the discussion. That is the principle adopted in all Legislative Assemblies. Of course we are not quite conversant with all the details of this and therefore it is possible that such duplication arises. But as we progress we will find that clear-cut distinctions ought to be made between the stage at which each clause should be discussed before the matter is referred to the Select Committee and the scope of discussion of the Select Committee report. I consider that at this stage it is not open to Hon'ble Members to discuss all the clauses of the Bill unless an amendment is moved definitely for the omission or modification thereof.

***Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.**—I cannot agree with my Hon'ble friend.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But the rule is there.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It has to be given a very wide interpretation. The rule is this :

"The debate shall be confined to consideration of the report of the Select Committee."

The report deals or concerns itself with the entire Bill that was placed before this House. At the first stage it often happens that the Bill is referred to a Select Committee without any discussion at all.

The Hon'ble Sri K.T. BHASHYAM.—It is wrong. Hon'ble Members ought to discuss principles or they will be deemed to have agreed to the principles.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The first stage is that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. I might agree for that. My point is, even if I have offered some opinions at that stage, it does not preclude me from offering my opinion at the second stage, *i.e.*, when the report of the Select Committee is taken into consideration. The second stage is the time when a full dress debate is necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the report of the Select Committee ?

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am afraid it is not so.

Janab MOHAMED HANIEF (Bangalore—Muslim).—On a point of information. When a Bill is referred to a Select Committee, is it not a fact that every one of the clauses is scrutinised

(JANAB MOHAMED HANIEF).

and considered by the Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Janab MOHAMED HANIEF.—If in the report no reference is made to any clause, it does not mean that the committee has not considered that clause. The last portion of rule 71 says :

"or any alternative suggestions consistent with the principle of the Bill."

The Hon'ble Sri K.T. BHASHYAM.—The Hon'ble Member is questioning the principle itself of the Bill.

Janab MOHAMED HANIEF.—No, no. He is giving alternative suggestions.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—"Alternative suggestions consistent with the principle of the Bill." But he wants to give a go-by to the principle.

Janab MOHAMED HANIEF.—He is giving alternative suggestions.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—He must send in an amendment to that effect.

Janab MOHAMED HANIEF.—We are on the point whether he could or could not.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It would serve no purpose because he did not send any amendment when the Bill was discussed in detail at the time it was taken up for consideration. Now no purpose will be served.

Janab MOHAMED HANIEF.—Is he technically precluded ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes. If the Hon'ble Member wants I shall just look into it and give a ruling.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—I may also invite the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to sub-clause (3) of rule 53.

"On the day on which any motion that the Bill be taken into consideration by the Assembly either at once or at some future day is moved, the principle of the Bill and its general provisions may be discussed, but the details of the Bill shall not be discussed further than is necessary to explain its principles."

So, it is clear. My Hon'ble friend said, "we generally refer it to the Select Committee without discussion." That is not the rule, that is not the fact. We go thoroughly into the general principles.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—In the first instance, the details of the Bill we cannot discuss according to this rule. The details can be discussed only at the second stage. It is a very important matter. Of course, Government, in order to escape criticism always want to take shelter under this rule. The matter, however, requires a full dress debate. The Chair would do well to allow us to study all this and what the procedure is in other legislatures.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give a ruling later.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—What I would suggest is, this question may be deferred and a time may be fixed for discussion on this matter. We will offer our opinions and Government may also offer their opinion, and then you can give a ruling.

Janab SYED ABDUR RAHMAN (Chikmagalur *cum* Shimoga—Muslim).—There is another point for consideration. When a Bill is introduced in the House and when it is discussed and referred to a Select Committee, then, does it necessarily mean that the House has accepted the principle ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Janab SYED ABDUR RAHMAN.—Is there any rule to that effect ? Supposing the Bill is introduced in the House and the House has not agreed to the principle, cannot such a bill be referred to the Select Committee ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the House has not agreed to the principle, the Bill cannot be referred to the Select Committee.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—If that was the view, I submit that much of the discussion that took place in the Parliament on the Select Committee report of the Press Bill would have been ruled out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They took up clause by clause and then they went on opposing the clauses ; not that they did not agree to the principle.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—That was at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Anyway, I shall look into it and give a ruling.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—As submitted by my Hon'ble friend an opportunity

may be given to us to submit our views in the matter.

Then again, Sir, Article 21-A deals with the making of new private extensions, etc. In my opinion it is not right that private parties should be given the right of forming lay-outs for the reason that things would not be done according to plan prepared by the Trust Board and further it also leads to a lot of corruption amongst the officials charged with the duty of giving permission and giving licenses, etc. So, on that ground also I submit that this provision for allowing private parties to make new extension or to make new lay-outs is unnecessary. It is undesirable to make this provision. With these few alternatives, with this observation I submit that the report submitted by the Select Committee may be accepted.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು (ತುಮಕೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ). —ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 18ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ (ಹಿಂದಿದ್ದ 19ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜು) ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರನ್ನು 'consult' ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 'May consult' ಎಂದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟ ವಿದ್ದರೆ ಕೇಳಬಹುದು, ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಎಂಬ ಸ್ವಾಯ್ತಚುಟರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯಿಂದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಪುರೋಗಾಮಿ ನೀತಿಯಲ್ಲ, ಪ್ರತಿಗಾಮಿಯಾದ ನೀತಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆ ಮೇಲೆ Betterment tax ಹಾಕುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲಿನವರು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇನೋ ನ್ಯಾಯ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು? ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಂದೇಸಮನಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ಯಾರಿಗೋ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಿರತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದನ್ನೇ ಇಡೀ ಬಡಜನಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಅನೇಕರಿಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರವರಿಗೆ ಹೊರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿರುವಂತೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು.

ಆಲ್ಲದೆ, Betterment tax ಹಾಕುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು improvements ಮಾಡಿದಾಕ್ಷಣ ಆ ಆಸ್ತಿಗಳ ಬೆಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೆಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನಾ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ 'improvements' ಏನೂ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಬೆಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಬಹುದು. ಹಿಂದೆ 1945 ರಲ್ಲಿಗೂ ಇಂದಿಗೂ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಂಥಾದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಳೆ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು underground drainage ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅದರಿಂದ ಬೆಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದು ಯಾವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, improvements ಮಾಡಿದ ಎಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ, ಯಾವ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ತಿಳಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ Betterment tax ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು property tax ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ಬೆಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿದಂತೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಈಗ ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಾಡಿದ improvements ಮತ್ತು ಲೇ ಔಟ್‌ಗಳ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಹೊಂದಿ ಬೇಕಾದವರು ಮನೆ ಮಠಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾರಿಕೊಂಡು ಲಾಭ ಹೊಂದಿದರು, ಹಣಗಳಿಸಿದರು, ಈಗ ಇನ್ನುಳಿದಿರುವ, ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ತಾತ್ಸಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸ್ಲಮ್ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚರಂಡಿ, ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಾಕ್ಷಣ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಚರಂಡಿ ರಸ್ತೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೇ ಆ ಮನೆಮಠಗಳ ಬೆಲೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಆಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಹೀಗೆ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು).

ಬಹುದು. ಅದೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ, ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಇರುವ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾರಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅಷ್ಟೆ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕಡೆ ಈಗ ಏನಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನೆ ಮಠಗಳನ್ನು ಉತ್ತಮ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಾಲ ಸೋಲ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಆ ಸಾಲಗಳ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆಯೂ ಬಿದ್ದರೆ, ನೀವು 25 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಂತು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಕೂಡ ಯಾವ ಸಾಲವನ್ನೂ ತೀರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗದೆ ಮನೆಯನ್ನೇ ಕಳೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ಆಚಾರ್ಯರವರು.—ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ? ಇರುವ ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆಯೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—ತೆರಿಗೆಕೊಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹರಾಜು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ಆಚಾರ್ಯರವರು.—Improvement ಗೆ expropriation ಏನಾದರೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—ಮತ್ತೆ? ನೀವು ಕೇಳಿದ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ಆಚಾರ್ಯರವರು.—ಅದೂ ನಿರಾಧಾರವಾದದ್ದು. Sir, it is a deliberate lie.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—ಕಾರಣ ಏನೇ ಇರಲಿ; ಆದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಹಾಕಿದರಾಯಿತು ಎಂಬ ಯೋಚನೆಯಿಂದ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri G. A. ACHARYA.—That again is false. Can the Government tax the people in any way it likes?

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Is he the spokesman of the Government, Sir?

Sri G. A. ACHARYA.—My commonsense demands that I should correct him.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Who is the gentleman to butt in and poke his nose?

Sri G. A. ACHARYA.—It is for the Hon'ble Speaker to say it; it is not for you. I shall obey him.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—ಏನೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ, ಆಗ್ಗೆ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಣದ ಅಭಾವ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅನೇಕ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಬೇಕುಬೇಕಾದಾಗ ಉಪಹಾರಗಳು, ಟೀ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗಳು, ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಸಿನಿಮಾ ತಾರೆಗಳು ಬಂದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಉಪಚಾರಗಳು ಮುಂತಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ದಾಸಪ್ಪನವರು.—ಯಾರು ಕೊಡುವವರು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು; ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇಂಥ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಮಿತವ್ಯಯದಿಂದ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Where is the relevancy Sir? This has nothing to do with the Municipal Council. This Bill relates to the Trust Board.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—

"18-L. Where the increase in value of any land is the result of the execution of an improvement scheme made on the recommendation of the Municipal Council and for which the Municipal Council has placed at the disposal of the Board the necessary funds for framing and carrying out such scheme, the betterment fee collected by the Board from the owners of such land shall be credited by the Board to the Municipal funds of the Council."

ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವವರು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನವರು, ಇದನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಆಯಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಗಳೇನಿವೆಯೋ ಅವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವುದು ಅವರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ. "Shall be paid to the Board" ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವನ್ನು

ಪಾಲಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಬೇಕಾದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಜನರಿಂದ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಊರನ್ನೂ ಅದರ ಆರೋಗ್ಯವನ್ನೂ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಗಲುವ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಅವರು ಜನರಲ್ ಫಂಡ್ಸ್‌ನಿಂದ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ರಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಥವ ಚರಂಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಒಂದು ರಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ತಾರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಥವ ಸಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಹೊಸ ಒಂದು ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದು ಯಾವ ನ್ಯಾಯ? ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬಂದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆತಿಥ್ಯ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಲೋಪ ದೋಷಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ, ಹಣವನ್ನು ಮಿತವ್ಯಯ ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಣ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ವೆಚ್ಚವಾಗುವಂತೆ ನಡೆನುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡದೆ, ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಹಾಕುವ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಮೇಲೂ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬೀಳಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಯಾರಾದರೊಬ್ಬರ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಲ್ಲ. ಒಟ್ಟು ನಗರವನ್ನೇ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವ ವೆಚ್ಚ. ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಟ್ಟ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಯಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ರಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಊರಿನ ಲಕ್ಷಣವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಲು ಮಾಡುವುದು. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆ ಇರುವವನೊಬ್ಬನು ತೆರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಹೀಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬನು ಸಾವಿರಾರು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅವನು ತನ್ನ ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಅಧಾರಮಾಡಿ ಸಾಲ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಡ್ಡಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗಾದರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಸುಖವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಆ ಭಾಗದವರು ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಬೇರೆ ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಮಾಡುವವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಬೀಳುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಖರ್ಚು ಒಟ್ಟು ನಗರವನ್ನು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗಾಗಲೇ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಲೇ ಔಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನುಳಿದಿರುವುದು ಕೇವಲ ಬಡಬಗ್ಗರು ವಾಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಭಾಗಗಳು. ಇವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಈ ಕಂದಾಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವುದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಇದೊಂದು undemocratic ನೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾನೂನು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ವಿತರಣೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹಾಕುವ ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಬ್ಳ್ಯು. ಎಚ್. ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪನವರು (ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ).— ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಕೊಂಚ ಪ್ರತಿಗಾಮಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದರೆ ಇದು ಪ್ರಗತಿಗಾಮಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಂತೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 'ಬೆಟರ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್' ಫೀ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ, ಏನೇ ಖರ್ಚಾದರೂ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡೇ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು, ಯಾರ ಮನೆಗಳು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯಾದರೂ ಕೂಡು ಅವರು ಬೆಟರ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಫೀ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ'' ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಇತರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ನೋಡಲಿ. ಕಲ್ಕತ್ತ, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ, ಮದ್ರಾಸು ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಯೋಚಿಸಲಿ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಟರ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಫೀ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಲಿ. ಇದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಹೊಸದಲ್ಲ; ಒಂದು ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮೊದಲು ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಆರೋಗ್ಯದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇರುವ ಕಡೆ ಅನಾರೋಗ್ಯವುಂಟಾದರೆ ಇತರ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ

(ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು. ಎಚ್. ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪನವರು). ಅನಾರೋಗ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ಪೌರಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವೆ ಎಂಬ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಯನ್ನೆತ್ತಿದರು. ಪೌರಸಭೆಯವರೇ ಬಂದು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಹಣ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಅವರೇ ಮಾಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಡವೆ? ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಅನೇಕ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇದೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಗಲುವ ವೆಚ್ಚಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಗೆ ಮುಂದಿಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—18ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಓದಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು. ಎಚ್. ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪನವರು.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡು ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವಾಗ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಆಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಪ್ಪರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವುದೂ ಬೇರೆ ವಿಷಯ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇ ಬೇರೆ ವಿಷಯ. 20 (a) ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವುದು ಬೇರೆ ವಿಷಯ.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ದಾಸಪ್ಪನವರು.—ಅವರು ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದುದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—I thought he was referring to my remarks.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು. ಎಚ್. ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪನವರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಕಾರಣವಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾನೂ ಅವರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸೇರಲು ಸಿದ್ಧನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದುದು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡು ಇರಬೇಕೇ ಅಥವ ಬೇಡವೆ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದುದೆ? ಅಲ್ಲ, ಅದು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿರುವಾಗ ಆ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಏನು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಆಡಚಣೆ ತರಬಾರದು, ಇದು ಸಾಧುವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಾದವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನಾವು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ, ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಡಿಲಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ, ಮದರಾಸು ಮುಂತಾದ ಇತರ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕಠಿಣವಾಗಿದ್ದುದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಇದನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡಿ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯಲು ಸಾಧಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ?

20-A (1) (i) ನಲ್ಲಿ the powers and functions of the municipal council or a committee thereof under the Mysore City Municipalities Act, 1933, shall be exercised and discharged by the Board, etc., ಎಂದಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು. ಎಚ್. ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪನವರು.—ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಳವನ್ನು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳದೆ ಆ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಲು ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು, ಇತರರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅಂಥಾ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳನ್ನು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥಾ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಸರಾಗವಾಗಿ

ನಡೆಯಲು, ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಏನು ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆಯೋ ಅವು ಹಂಗಾಮಿಯಾಗಿ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೂ ಇರಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿ ಲೇಔಟ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರು ಒಬ್ಬರು, ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರು ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರೆಂದರೆ "ಕುದುರೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೂಡುವರೊಬ್ಬರು, ಲಗಾಮು ಹಿಡಿಯುವವರೊಬ್ಬರು" ಎಂಬಂತೆ ಆಗಿ, ಅದು ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಲೋಪ ದೋಷಗಳೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಜನರ ಆರೋಗ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಬೆಂಬಲ ನೀಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I agree to the reasons put forward by my friends Sri Siddappa and Sri B. Hutche Gowda for not accepting the report of the Select Committee on this Bill.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—No, no. He qualified it by saying 'partially'.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Some of the recommendations because these recommendations are very derogatory. Another reason as to why the recommendations should not be accepted is that after all this piece of legislation and all these recommendations are expressly against the wishes of the Mysore City Municipality. The Mysore City Municipality has unequivocally and deliberately resolved and sent a resolution to the Government that this piece of legislation should not be introduced and should be withdrawn and also they have refused to send their representatives to the Select Committee that was constituted by this House. So this piece of legislation is sought to be pushed through against the opposition and against the will of the Mysore City Municipality. I do not know then what prompted the Government to introduce this measure before this House and why they want to seek the approval of this House for it. They must show what the circumstances and the reasons were that induced them to bring in this measure before this House. Of course, we are having a series of legislation.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Is it again open for him to start all the fun over again? That question will be decided and the ruling of the Speaker awaited.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Please let us express our views. I say I am entitled to .....

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—I consider it a manifest abuse of the privilege accorded to the speaker.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I say I am going to make an alternative suggestion. Since this piece of legislation is against the wishes of the Mysore City Municipality and since the representatives of the Mysore City Municipality were not associated with the Select Committee, it is necessary that the Government should withdraw it and refer the matter back to the Mysore City Municipality and only after having their opinion and after having their representatives on the Committee this measure should be pushed through. Otherwise, it will be an arbitrary measure and directly against the wishes of the citizens who are living in the City Municipality.

Secondly, I oppose two clauses very vehemently. The first one is the delegation of powers to the Chairman of the Trust Board. It has been pointed out by my friends that the Trust Board really does not represent the people but it is merely a creature of the Government because most of its members are either nominated or appointed by the Government. Except two representatives from the Mysore City Municipality, all the others owe their origin to the Government. Why this Government which is supposed to be a democratic Government should still have a preponderant voice over this Board is a matter to be considered by the members of this House. (A Voice.—It is because it is democratic).

Next, when you consider the powers entrusted to the Chairman of the Trust Board, he enjoys immense powers and he is only guided by the instructions of the Government. It is not always desirable and we cannot

(JANAB J. MOHAMED IMAM).

presume that the Board always does the right.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Hon'ble Member suggesting that there should be no Trust Board at all ?

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I am now debating about the increased powers of the Board and the powers given to the Chairman. The Chairman may resolve one fine morning that ex-Presidents of the Trust Board and the Municipality must be given sites free or at reasonable rates or at a very nominal rate. That is why increased powers should not be given to the Trust Board, because there is every possibility of their increased powers being misused. We have got examples. It so happens that this very Board wanted to give very valuable sites free of cost. This matter came up.....

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—I think it is horrible misrepresentation. They never decided that any site should be given free of cost.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I can give the particulars, but I do not want. I ask my friend to refer to the proceedings. I know it because I had something to do with it.

Sri G. A. ACHARYA (Bangalore District—General).—If a statement is made by the Hon'ble Member that sites are wanted to be given free, we have to show whether it is true or it is something else.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The Trust Board passed a resolution that sites should be given at nominal rate...

Mr. SPEAKER.—But the Hon'ble Member said that they were proposed to be given 'free'.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—At nominal rate to persons who were previously Presidents and others.....

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—My Hon'ble friend finds no difference between 'giving a site free of cost' and 'charging a fee'.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—This is one example. As between the City Municipality and the Trust Board it looks as if the Government have placed more reliance on the Trust Board than on the Municipality. On the other hand there may be a case for abolishing the Trust Board and handing over its powers and functions to the Municipality. But here so much reliance is placed on the Trust Board firstly because it is purely a Government agency and secondly it always comes into conflict with the City Municipality. We are not justified in endowing so much power either to the Trust Board or to the Chairman. That is number one.

Secondly, the introduction of the provision empowering the Government to suspend the activities of the City Municipality regarding some functions over an area will always lead to conflict because it is provided here that some of the functions of the City Municipality may be transferred to the Trust Board, which will always create a deadlock between the City Municipality and the Trust Board.

The other points have been dealt with by my friends. Only regarding the betterment fee, I must again state that if that fee is going to be levied in the City of Mysore it will be against the wishes of the people in the City of Mysore and against the wishes of the City Municipality.

It was argued by some of my friends that if there is any enhancement in the value it is but right that a portion of it must be surrendered to the Trust Board. But I may state that a person, if he is holding certain assets or property and if the value of the property goes up, pays it in some other way on account of the enhanced value, because the assessment that he pays on that property will also be correspondingly reduced or increased. Suppose when he purchases that property the site cost only Rs. 1,000 and on account of the improvement the value goes up to Rs. 5,000. He pays an assessment on Rs. 5,000. So there is a corresponding benefit to the Municipality. But now they not only levy this enhanced assessment tax, but they want to take away also some of the good portion of the enhanced value on account of the improvement made. So on account of this, I associate myself with my friends in opposing these clauses.

I may suggest that there is no need to hasten this legislation. Let them take this back and let them consult the City Municipal Council and get their approval. After all we are concerned with the well-being and welfare of the people living within the City Municipality. When they have opposed it, certainly there is no justification for the Government to proceed with this measure. Let them refer the matter to the Municipal Council and take their opinion and take their representatives also on the Select Committee. Otherwise, if they proceed with this measure it would be an arbitrary measure and their action will not be democratic and people will only say that Government have got a big majority and so they have pushed this measure in the teeth of the opposition.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಆರ್. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠೇಶ್ವರ್‌ರವರು (ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವೀಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಯುಗದಲ್ಲಿ. ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳಿದ್ದೇ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂಬುದು ಶತಸ್ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಒಮ್ಮತದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರುವ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷವೆಂದರೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್. ಅವರೂ ನಾವು ಸೇರಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯಮಾಡಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ರೀತಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಿರುವಾಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸಚಿವರು ಮುಂಡಿಸಿರುವ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದರೆ ಇಡೀ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಜನರಿಗೆ ದ್ರೋಹ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಮುಂದಾಗುವ ಸಾಧಕ ಭಾದಕಗಳೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಆಗಲೇ ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸಚಿವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಬೆಂಬಲಿಗರೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯಮಾಡಿ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಿದ್ದೇ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂಮೆಂಟ್ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮೈಸೂರಿನದು ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಆಯಿತು. ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸದಿಂದ ಇದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನೇಕ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿವೆ. ಇಡೀ ಮೈಸೂರು ಜನರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಂಚಮಟ್ಟಿಗಾದರೂ ಗೌರವ ಕೊಡುವುದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಅವರ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಲ ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿ ಪುನಃ ಸಮಾಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ತರೋಣ. ಈಗ ತರುವುದು ಉಚಿತವಲ್ಲ. ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನವರು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವು ಸಮ್ಮತಿ ಕೊಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅವರು ನಿರ್ಣಯಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವಾಗ ನಾವು ಹಠಾತ್ತಾಗಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ಶಾಸನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇಡೀ ಜನರಿಗೇ ದ್ರೋಹ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ವಾಪಸುತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮುಂದೆ ಕೆಲವು ತಿಂಗಳಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ತರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thought that after the very interesting debate we had the other day when we considered the City of Bangalore Improvement (Amendment) Bill or the report of the Select Committee on that Bill, this measure would certainly have quite a normal and an easy passage and that there would be no debate at all. But my Hon'ble friends who have spoken have chosen, even with regard to this Bill, to make best efforts to try—I will not say sabotage—if they cannot see that somehow the passage of the Bill is prevented. But I am indeed surprised that having swallowed the camel my friends should be straining at the gnat. All the provisions of the Bill—let alone the recommendations of the Select Committee—have been practically considered in detail and the House has accorded its support. Now again, my Hon'ble friends—the very same

(THE HON'BLE SRI H. C. DASAPPA).

friends—are making this effort. Barring Sri Sreekanteshwar, the others, I dare say, have no interest in it. They are not directly concerned with the working of the City Municipal Council or the Corporation. They come outside these two areas. That they should have exhibited such an enormous amount of interest speaks that they are very much interested in things which do not concern them.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—I do not quite follow my Hon'ble friend.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Still, I welcome criticisms wherever they shed light of some sort. But I am afraid that in this case, far from shedding any light, they do not in the least throw any light whatsoever on the discussions. Let me take my friend Sri Siddappa's criticisms. He said that barring clause 18 of the Bill which relates to certain powers and functions of the Municipal Council being made over to the Trust Board and a bit about the defect in the constitution, the rest of the Bill as well as the report of the Select Committee were quite acceptable to him. But, that the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition to which the Hon'ble Member Sri L. Siddappa belongs, should take up a totally different attitude and say that the whole Bill must be thrown overboard, shows what kind of cohesion and unanimity there is in the opposition party.

Sri G. A. ACHARYA.—Is there no co-operation in the Opposition?

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—That is none of your concern.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—You will know what cohesion there is among us.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—You wait for a few more days and you will know what it is. Now the two things which Sri L. Siddappa referred to are: one relating to the constitution of the Board and the other relating to what is known as delegating certain powers, in certain emergencies or in special circumstances, of the Municipal Council to the Trust Board. As regards the constitution of the Board he said that there are only two elected representatives of the Municipal Council on the Board. And what is more that statement was reinforced by the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition. How I wish they had seen the constitution itself! It is provided there that the Vice-President of the Municipal Council shall be a member *ex-officio*? Is he not an elected representative of the Municipal Council? Why try to mislead the House? A statement like that emanating from such a responsible person, may mislead the House very much. Place all the facts before the House and I have no objection to the Hon'ble Members drawing whatever conclusions they like from those facts. But the facts must be placed before the House. Take the constitution of the Madras Trust Board. How many members of the Corporation are on the Madras City Improvement Trust Board? There are only two. Like wise, in most of the Trust Boards in India, I think the average does not exceed two. In Mysore for a bigger body like the Corporation we have provided four and for the Municipal Council here we have provided three. What is the total strength of the Bangalore Trust Board? It is 11; but here the total strength is 10. Therefore let there be no question that we are trying to reduce the number of representatives of the Municipal Council on the Board by any means. Of course, the Hon'ble Member Sri Siddappa was pleased to say that the rest of the Bill was an improvment over the existing constitution.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Why does the Hon'ble Minister put it to my mouth?

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—He said that the Superintending Engineer need not be there because the Government Architect is there. I am only trying to understand. If the Hon'ble Member thinks that having the Government Architect instead of the Superintending Engineer is a retrograde step, I have nothing to say.

The other charge is with regard to the appointment of the Commissioner. In Bangalore we have the Commissioner on the Trust Board. The Chief Executive Officer of the City Municipality or the Commissioner ought to serve on the Trust Board for varied and good reasons because he will be a

perfect *liaison* between the two bodies; he knows the entire working of the Municipal Council. Am I to think that the inclusion of the Chief Executive Officer in the Mysore City Trust Board is a retrograde step? I leave it to the Hon'ble Members to decide. In other places, not only is the Commissioner on the Trust Board but also the Chairman of the Trust Board who is more or less an *ex-officio* member of the Corporation or an extra member of the Corporation. The whole conception or framework of this measure is to bring about a fine *liaison* between the two bodies and see if they cannot work in consultation with one another and improve the cities on right lines. That such a wholesome step should be opposed by those far away from the cities is extremely surprising to me.

The Hon'ble Member Sri Siddappa's other criticism was with regard to clause 19 of the Bill. As the Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to say, the Select Committee has not meddled or interfered with that clause. When the Bill was placed before the House for consideration and when it was referred to the Select Committee after discussion here it has to be taken for granted that the main principles of the Bill are accepted by the House. Otherwise, it was open for them to have launched an attack or criticism on that part of the Bill. But I did not hear a breath from the Opposition when the Bill was taken up for consideration here. Am I to take it seriously that intelligence dawned on them only to-day, though the Bill was in their hands for so many days, for launching the criticism that parts of the Bill are unacceptable to them? The House has to draw its own conclusions therefrom, especially when they are on the eve of the elections. When our friends make such a criticism at such a late hour even in violation of the spirit of the rules we have ourselves adopted, the House has to draw its own conclusions.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I rise to a point of order. The Chair has not given its ruling.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—That is my view.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It is a matter of *subjudice*. He cannot say like that.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—I am not going to dispute the Hon'ble Speaker's interpretation if it goes against me. But that is my view and I am going to contend that that is the correct view when and if the matter comes up for discussion. What is after all this clause? Hon'ble Member Sri Siddappa made it appear that for nothing at all the powers of the Municipal Council would be transferred to the Trust Board. I wish he had understood the circumstances in which such transference becomes necessary. Let me assure him that there is nothing very wonderful or new about this provision. It has been there in the Act ever since the Act was formulated somewhere in 1903. Section 20 of the Act refers to some of the sections under which the Municipal Council exercises powers and which ought to be vested in the Trust Board in certain circumstances. What we now say is, the City Municipal Council has undergone a lot of modification; the Corporation has undergone a radical modification, that instead of referring to the sections here and there, after consultation with the Municipal Council we want to transfer certain powers in certain cases. For instance, we want to have a lay-out; who is to give licence for the construction of houses there? The Trust Board has a full scheme as to what the houses should appear like; what would be the straight line; what is the area in which it has to be built—all these things the Trust Board has got. If the licensing of the buildings is to be left to the Municipal Council, it is quite likely that it is not aware of the full or entire scheme and it may give licence for a building which may just look like a house or which may project beyond the straight line. This is a simple matter and nobody need understand that we are going to snatch away the powers of the Municipal Council for no reason. For instance, what is to happen with regard to water supply or with regard to the maintenance of certain social amenities required for an extension?

(THE HON'BLE SRI H. C. DASAPPA). Supposing it is vested in the Municipal Council; there is a time lag between the forming of the lay-out and the construction of the houses. Do you mean to say that none of the civic amenities should be given to the lay-out raised until the power is vested in the Municipal Council? You should have interim measures like looking after water supply, lighting, etc., and in fact this section provides for only giving such kinds of amenities until it is vested in the Municipal Council. In practice we have had certain difficulties and let me assure the Hon'ble Member Sri Siddappa that when the representatives of the Corporation of Bangalore met us in the Select Committee there they had not the slightest objection to this provision here; on the other hand they welcomed the assistance which the Trust Board should render to the Municipal Council. To create a conflict where it does not exist between the local self-governing Body and the Trust Board, where there is a splendid opportunity for co-operation and mutual benefit, to suggest that there is likely to be a conflict, I think, is not right.

Then Sir, my Hon'ble friend Sri L. Siddappa referred also to private lay-outs. On this we have devoted a great deal of thought. It is true that even in the Select Committee, certain Hon'ble Members felt very strongly that no opportunity should be given for any private lay-outs. But, from our experience we have found that if we have got to develop the cities rapidly, we will do well to allow private lay-outs but under definite conditions imposed rigorously by the Trust Board. If you study the rules you will find out that any private person will have to subscribe to every one of these conditions. The whole plan in regard to streets, drainage, lighting and water supply should be as per the Trust Board designs and plans. What does it matter which is the agency that makes the lay-out so long as all conditions thereto are fulfilled? Therefore Sir, I think there is absolutely no substance in that kind of criticism.

Then, Sri B. Hutche Gowda said,—I do not know whether he has understood some of the implications of the provisions; anyway, he said—about the betterment fee to which Sri L. Siddappa subscribed willingly or unwillingly, that it hits the poor and it is the poor who pay it. Sir, generally speaking, this thing is trotted out more or less as a kind of slogan against any kind of reform. But does it really hit the poor, is the question. If any improvement is going to be made, are we to think that it is done in a place where only the poor reside? Never. If a poor man is there and if he has got a small bit of land, probably what he has got to contribute is very low. If the area is large, fairly well-to-do men who live there will bear the large portion. So, I do not think there is any substance in that argument also. By the by, the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition comes from Jagalur and I think the name of the place has got something to do with the attitude he takes. (*Loud Laughter*).

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—For the benefit of my friend I may say, *Jagat Ooru* is *Jagalur*.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Anyway, he said that no member of the Mysore Municipal Council was on the Select Committee. How is he sure of that? One member of the Mysore City Municipal Council who is here in the Legislature, was on the Select Committee and he has subscribed to it. We have given an unanimous report.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Who is it?

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Sri K. Puttaswamy I was referring to. He was on the Select Committee. I quite see that the City Municipal Council, as Sri Sreekanteswar said, have passed a resolution that the Trust Board may be abolished. Now, Sir, if the Trust Board has to be abolished and if this House is to decide upon the question of the abolition of the Trust Board, that is a different matter; I would have no grouse at all. But, so long as there is a Trust Board, it must be enabled to function efficiently and usefully and these provisions are the quintessence of the experiences of both

the Trust Boards. No doubt, the Municipal Council took up an attitude like that. I wonder whether the attitude was quite correct. It is quite likely that the Council had a different point of view to look at it. But, it does not mean by any means that because the Municipal Council felt that the Trust Board.....

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—But it was an unanimous resolution of the Municipal Council.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—May be unanimous. That is not the point. The point is, the question of abolition of the Trust Board is a totally different issue. Here, we are trying to improve upon what provisions exist for the improvement of the city. So, let there be no confusion between the two issues. It is open for any Hon'ble Member here to bring in a motion to abolish the Trust Board. I cannot prevent any member of the House from bringing in any such motion. But, whether that motion will commend itself to the House is a totally different matter. Well, all that I can say is this. There is a great responsibility on this Government or on any Government to see that every phase of activity in the State is helped, is fostered, is nurtured and nourished well. I may have the permission of my Hon'ble colleagues to say that predominantly this Government has something like a rural bias; the Congress still has got a rural bias. But, it does not mean that these cities should be allowed to be neglected or the progress of the cities should be of no concern to them. It would be a sorry day if we ever take up an attitude like that. Therefore, we have here provided a necessary measure of legislation, just and no more than what is necessary, for the purpose of efficient working of the Trust Board. I commend this motion for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now adjourn for lunch.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Fifty Minutes past Two of the Clock and reassembled at Twenty Minutes past Three of the Clock, Mr. Speaker (The Hon'ble Sri V. Venkatappa) in the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses 2 to 31, both inclusive. The question is:

"That Clauses 2 to 31, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 31, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is:

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is:

"That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Sir, I move:

"That the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

Statement *re*: General Elections in Mysore.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA (Minister for Finance and Industries):—The Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to say that the Hon'ble Sri K. T. Bhashyam may make a statement about the arrangement for the General Elections, about the constituencies and so on. If the Hon'ble Speaker allows it, the Hon'ble Minister is ready to make the statement. It is left to the Hon'ble Speaker.